



APPROVED JULY 12, 2006

**PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF SCOTTSDALE
CITY HALL KIVA
3939 NORTH DRINKWATER BOULEVARD
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA
JUNE 28, 2006**

STUDY SESSION MINUTES

PRESENT: Steve Steinberg, Chairman
James Heitel, Vice-Chairman
David Barnett, Commissioner
Jeffrey Schwartz, Commissioner (arrived 4:47 p.m.)
Steven Steinke, Commissioner
Eric Hess, Commissioner
Kevin O'Neill, Commissioner

STAFF PRESENT: Randy Grant
Sherry Scott
Joe Padilla
Tim Curtis
Greg Williams
Kim Chafin
Dan Symer

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

The study session of the Scottsdale Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Steinberg at 4:08 p.m.

2. **ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT - LUSIA GALAV**

None.

3. **DISCUSSION ON GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT CRITERIA**

Mr. Grant recalled the proposal considered by the Planning Commission to amend the criteria for the major General Plan amendments which was not initiated by City Council. He requested feedback from the Planning Commission

APPROVED

regarding what would be an appropriate next step for the major General Plan amendment.

Commissioner Barnett expressed concern that the once a year restriction creates a hurdle for the owner from a carry cost standpoint, due to the uncertainty of the process. He opined the major General Plan amendments could be processed at any time of the year while still going through the same process. Commissioner Barnett suggested that the ten acre criteria be reevaluated, differentiating between the area north of the CAP and the southern area.

Chairman Steinberg inquired about the reason there was an April deadline for an August hearing on major General Plan amendments. Mr. Grant explained that the Growing Smarter legislation reestablished for communities what was required to change the General Plan; it requires that cities adopt a criteria for determining when a change to the General Plan qualifies as a major amendment to the General Plan. State law requires that for cases that meet the criteria there can only be hearings once a year; there must be a certain amount of preparatory notification, jurisdictional notification, and open houses.

4. **DISCUSSION ON ABANDONMENTS IN THE FOOTHILLS DISTRICT**

Mr. Grant stated that he would like to expand the discussion of abandonments in the Foothills district to an overall discussion of transportation issues in general, particularly as they relate to localized planning efforts.

Mr. Grant reviewed the questions that relate to infrastructure needs on a neighborhood scale. He noted that community development has shifted from raw land development to smaller projects that require decisions on infrastructure issues. Many parcels being developed only have access onto major streets, which raises the question of whether or not to create alternate access in order to reduce the impact on traffic flow. Mr. Grant opined that topographic and geographic considerations make the implementation of traditional grids impractical, particularly in the northern part of the community. He reviewed the challenges of coordinating locations of infrastructure on an incremental basis, noting the conflicts that have arisen with abandonment and easement decisions.

Mr. Grant stated that the question which arises from the issues is whether to prepare map-based plans or policy-based plans. He reviewed the different characteristics of each type of plan and the pros and cons of each.

When looking at the plans that currently exist an understanding can be gained about how plans may be implemented. The Regional Transportation Plan was adopted by the Maricopa Association of Governments and all the cities in the region comply with that plan to some extent. Next is the Scottsdale General Plan, which is a policy-based document which classifies a few street systems on maps, while the remainder are determined by policies as implementation goes through. The Streets Master Plan actually shows street classifications and gives an indication what a street cross section would be for a particular classification. The Transportation Master Plan is attempting to combine all of this into one document which will be more easily understood. The final document is the Design Standards and Policies Manual; which is a technical document.

Mr. Grant stated that it is difficult to use these tools to deal with localized planning. It is difficult to have a rigid set of maps when conditions are continually changing in local areas. Staff is attempting to provide better context for abandonment requests that come through, but they are difficult to process without a structured plan against which to evaluate them.

Mr. Grant stated that the Commissioners would be provided with the principles that are currently used in making determinations. He asked the Commissioners for input and comments regarding difficulties they face in making decisions and recommendations to City Council.

Vice-Chairman Heitel opined that the City is presuming to know on a local level how everything is going to ultimately develop; the abandonment process is being driven by the streets and no one has recognized that other uses may be needed in the future. He questioned whether abandonments should be processed at all until the City is certain that the right-of-ways are not needed. Mr. Grant stated that staff would like to provide enough confidence based on neighborhood input to make recommendations, which goes back to deciding whether mapping or policy plans would be more beneficial.

Commissioner Steinke opined that guidelines needed to be developed that would transcend through generations of Planning Commission and City Council members in order to change the trend of individual decision making. He recalled a comment from a previous meeting that the City ought to consider what it wants to be before it allows abandonments.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner O'Neill in regards to GLO abandonments and having no context for the surrounding areas, Mr. Grant committed to making a broader effort to identify the context and provide it to the Planning Commission.

In response to a question by Chairman Steinberg regarding nonconforming uses as a result of GLO abandonments, Mr. Grant explained that maps will provide something to refer too. The new process is to measure setbacks from the edge of the GLO, which will allow for building without having to acquire a variance. Mr. Grant opined that having GLOs mapped will be the best tool to avoid issuing building permits in GLO easements and other potential problems.

Commissioner Barnett suggested that a system be established requiring a that a three-quarter mile square surrounding the property or some other designation that is not of a regional nature or property specific be brought in when applying for an easement or abandonment. This type of system would force neighborhoods to come together in deciding what type of policy they want for their neighborhood. Commissioner Barnett requested that the subject be discussed at the next meeting. Mr. Grant opined that Commissioner Barnett had a great idea; staff could work with applicants to encourage them to bring in multiple parcels that are logical from the global standpoint.

5. UPDATE ON TEXT AMENDMENTS

Mr. Grant stated that two text amendments were on the agenda, both dealing with ESLO.

Mr. Grant stated that several other text amendments will be presented to the Commission after the summer break, including one that deals with helicopter landings in residential districts.

6. **REVIEW OF JUNE 28, 2006 AGENDA**

INITIATION

Mr. Grant noted the scheduled initiation was for a text amendment concerning temporary fencing screening mechanisms.

CONTINUANCES

46-ZN-1990#17

Grayhawk Parcel 2n Rezoning

Mr. Grant noted a request for continuance to the August 23, 2006 Planning Commission meeting.

EXPEDITED AGENDA

25-ZN-2005

Earll Drive Condominiums

Mr. Grant stated that Commissioner Schwartz requested that this item be moved to the regular agenda.

In response to an inquiry by Chairman Steinberg, Mr. Grant explained that the entire downtown area was classified as mixed use in the General Plan and many projects come through as strictly residential.

It was the general consensus of the Commission that the item be moved to the regular agenda.

2-AB-2006

Novak Residence

Mr. Grant noted that the item was a GLO abandonment request.

Vice-Chairman Heitel stated that the abandonment to the north of the property was necessary because of building and planning issues. He opined that the abandonment to the east reflected the recurring problem with abandonments being granted for no reason. Vice-Chairman Heitel requested that the application be changed to reflect only an abandonment of the northern area, noting the Applicant had agreed to the change.

Mr. Grant confirmed that the change could be made during a motion while keeping the item on the expedited agenda.

REGULAR AGENDA

14-GP-2005

McCormick Ranch Condos

22-ZN-2005

McCormick Ranch Condos

APPROVED

15-AB-2004 Biel Property

Mr. Grant noted that this application had previously been denied by the Planning Commission and was returning with modifications.

2-TA-2006 ESL Text Amendment

6-TA-2006 Minor Amendments to ESL

Chairman Steinberg requested that 15-AB-2004, the Biel property, be moved to the expedited agenda.

7. **REVIEW OF JULY 12, 2006 TENTATIVE AGENDA**

Mr. Grant stated that the Desert Discovery Center, the text amendment concerning aircraft landings and zoning definitions, and the Loco Patron use permit were tentatively scheduled for the July 12, 2006 meeting.

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to discuss, the study session adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
A/V Tronics, Inc.

APPROVED